have been withdrawn from consideration. New claims 32-39 have been added. New claims 32-39 are readable on the elected species. Applicants reserve the right to further prosecute the canceled claims 22-28 and the withdrawn claims 1-21 and 29-31 in this and/or any other applications. Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections in light of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claims 22-28 depend from nonelected claims. The cancellation of claims 22-28 obviates this rejection, which should thus be withdrawn. New claims 32-39 are not dependent on nonelected claims and are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Katz in view of Pappas. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have canceled claims 22-28 solely for the purposes of advancing prosecution of this application. However, the arguments presented below with regard to new claims 32-39 are equally applicable to canceled claims 22-28.

New claim 32 recites an antistatic fabric container including a fabric, a coating of thermoplastic polymer and a

layer of cellulose, both positioned upon at least one side of the fabric. The fabric is formed of interwoven warp and weft yarns. New claims 33-39 depend from claim 32 and include further limitations thereto.

The addition of a layer of cellulose to a fabric with the above-described composition provides a novel and nonobvious result. Tests run with the fabric as recited in claim 32 indicate that such containers are particularly resistant to the creation of incendiary discharges. There is no motivation or suggestion to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Pappas with Katz to achieve such a nonobvious result, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Katz teaches methods for coating and laminating flexible plastic articles having superior strength characteristics. Katz discloses that coating flexible plastic articles prevents leakage of the powdery or liquid substances placed therein. More particularly, Katz discloses flexible plastic articles, including flexible bulk bags which are made of woven plastic fabric and to which a thin film or coating of plastic may be applied (column 1, lines 16-25). Katz further discloses a method for creating a multi-layer flexible plastic bag that includes a sheet of kraft paper, such paper being used to add even greater protection against leakage in case a barrier layer is damaged (column 8, lines 38-43; column 10, lines 29-36).

Katz, however, fails to teach or even suggest that the inclusion of such paper to flexible bulk containers would result in the antistatic properties disclosed in the present invention. The Katz reference makes absolutely no mention of superior antistatic properties in such bags, and it is not known whether the bags described in Katz would exhibit such properties. There is furthermore no reason to believe that the bags described in Katz would exhibit the superior antistatic properties as disclosed in the present invention.

Pappas teaches the use of flexible plastic fabric in flexible intermediate bulk containers. More particularly, Pappas teaches a fabric comprised of axially oriented, crystalline polypropylene or polyethylene compositions. Pappas further teaches that the fabric may be coated with a thermoplastic material. Pappas, however, does not disclose or suggest the use of a cellulose material for dissipating electrostatic charge in flexible bulk containers.

There is no motivation or teaching that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the Katz and Pappas references to achieve the unexpected result of no observed incendiary discharges as disclosed in the specification. The Examiner is specifically directed to the first two paragraphs on page 20 of the specification. These paragraphs indicate that a fabric container as in claim 32 had no observed incendiary

discharges, while a fabric container without a thermoplastic polymer coating and a layer of cellulose exhibited such discharges.

Neither Katz nor Pappas discloses that inclusion of a cellulose material within a fabric container would result in the observed absence of incendiary electrostatic discharges. Accordingly, the present invention as embodied in claim 32 is not obvious in light of these two references.

New claims 33-39 include further limitations to new claim 32. The arguments presented with regard to new claim 32 are equally applicable to new claims 33-39. Specifically, new claim 33 recites that the layer of cellulose is laminated to the same side of the fabric as the coating of thermoplastic polymer. New claim 34 recites that the layer of cellulose and the coating of thermoplastic polymer are on different sides of the fabric. New claim 35 recites that the coating of thermoplastic polymer is on both sides of the fabric. New claim 36 recites that the layer of cellulose is on both sides of the fabric. New claim 37 provides particular compositions for the yarns utilized in the fabric, as well as the thermoplastic coating. New claim 38 recites that the layer of cellulose material is laminated to at least one side of the fabric. New claim 39 recites that the coating of thermoplastic polymer is adhered to at least one side of the fabric.

Applicants believe new claims 32-39 overcome all the rejections cited by the Examiner in the Office action. Applicants believe new claims 32-39 are now in form for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN, L.L.P.

By: _____
Donald A. Gregory
Registration No. 28,954

2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700

Date: May 8, 1995